REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 to 6, 9 to 11, 14, 15, 23, 25 to 29, 32 and 33 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 11, 23 and 29 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 8, 9, 13 to 15, and 31 to 33 contain allowable subject matter. As shown above, Applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter of claim 13 into independent claim 11, and the allowable subject matter of claim 31 into independent claim 29. In both claims, the step of generating a report has been removed; however, since the Examiner believed that to be disclosed in the art, this amendment is not believed to affect patentability of the claims. Accordingly, independent claims 11 and 29, and the claims that depend therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include features of allowable dependent claim 8 and intervening claim 7, along with other changes. In particular, claim 1 now reads a method comprising using a delegation service provider to receive, from a delegator, a designation of a role and a delegate to assume the role, receive, from a credential service provider, an indication that the designation is valid, generate a delegation credential in response to receiving the indication, and provide the delegation credential to the delegator or delegate. The credential service provider is used to receive the delegation credential as part of a process for accessing a service, receive an access requirement for accessing the service, where the access requirement is received from a relying party that provides the service, and determine if the delegation credential is valid for the access requirement. Determining if the delegation credential is valid comprises

Applicants : Ernie F. Brickell, *et al.*
Serial No. : 09/998,549
Filed : November 28, 2001
Page : 11 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-505001
Intel Docket No.: P8790X

providing the delegation credential to a verification service that compares the delegation credential to pre-existing delegation credentials that correspond to the access requirement. The credential service provider is also used to enable access to the service if the delegation credential comprises a valid delegation credential for the delegate.

The applied art, namely Gassner, Chang and Bowman-Amuah, is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to receiving the delegation credential as part of a process for accessing a service, receiving an access requirement for accessing the service, where the access requirement is received from a relying party that provides the service, and determining if the delegation credential is valid for the access requirement, where determining if the delegation credential is valid comprises providing the delegation credential to a verification service that compares the delegation credential to pre-existing delegation credentials that correspond to the access requirement.

In this regard, Gassner describes an authentication system in which a user delegates authority to a workstation through the user of a delegation certificate. Specifically, a smart card provided by the user provides the delegation certificate to the workstation (see, e.g., col. 13, lines 36 to 46 and 60 to 64 of Gassner). There is no mention in Gassner of a receiving an access requirement from a relying party that provides the service or of determining if a delegation credential is valid for the access requirement by comparing the delegation credential to pre-existing delegation credentials corresponding to the access requirement, and then enabling access if the delegation credential is permissible. At best, Gassner describes an access control list that includes system privileges and users with access to those privileges. A user's name is compared

Applicants : Ernie F. Brickell, *et al.*
Serial No. : 09/998,549
Filed : November 28, 2001
Page : 12 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-505001
Intel Docket No.: P8790X

to the privileges on the list and, if there is match, the user is provided with access to the privilege (see, e.g., the Summary of Gassner). As described in sections 9.1 and 9.2 of Gassner, access privileges are granted based on predefined principal sets, which identify both principals and delegates who are permitted access to an object.[1] Gassner thus does not make its determination using the delegation certificate (Gassner's alleged delegation credential), and does not receive an access requirement from a relying party that provides the service.

Chang was cited for its alleged disclosure of a verification service, and Bowman-Amuah was cited for its alleged disclosure of generating a report. These references are not understood to add anything that would remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Gassner vis-à-vis claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Amended independent claim 23 is an article of manufacture claim that includes some of the same features as claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons explained above with respect to claim 1.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

---

[1] See, e.g., col. 16, line 40 to col. 19, line 20 of Gassner.

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of

unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that

the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the

Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All

telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

Please apply any fees or credits due in this case, which are not already covered by check,

to Deposit Account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-505001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 21, 2006

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21518624.doc